

• F1234

• U566

Qp. 2

1234
1566
py 2

INVESTIGATION OF MEXICAN AFFAIRS.

REPORT OF SENATOR ALBERT B. FALL TO THE SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS, EXAMINING INTO MEXICAN AFFAIRS.

Printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PARTIAL AND AD INTERIM REPORT.

20-26430

WASHINGTON, D. C., *December 9, 1919.*

On November 16, 1919, the chairman of your subcommittee proceeded to the border for the purpose of transacting official business in connection with your investigation and preparing for hearings to be held by the subcommittee in the border States after December 1.

While en route to Three Rivers, N. Mex., where I stopped one day to attend to personal affairs, I received at Chicago, and Kansas City, and immediately upon leaving the train at Three Rivers, telegrams from other members of the committee, and at least one other Senator insisting that my presence was, or would be, necessary in Washington, and urging that I should return to this city as soon after November 20, as possible.

I had Capt. Hanson and other investigators arrange to meet me at El Paso, Tex., on November 21, that I might, before returning to Washington, receive reports from them supplementing other information in the possession of the Department of State, and also in the possession of your committee, and bearing directly upon important and critical matters concerning your investigation.

As you are aware, your committee and the Department of State have been cooperating in Mexican matters, and particularly in your investigation thereof, especially since the date of November 14, 1919. Such cooperation has been of the most frank, cordial and pleasant nature. Under the direction of the Secretary of State, the United States ambassador to Mexico, Mr. Fletcher, and the minister to Cuba, Mr. Boaz Long, both of whom have been in this city for some time past, have been in almost constant touch with your committee, advising and cooperating with us.

4566
copy 2

Before leaving this city on November 16, I notified the Department of State of my purpose in leaving here, and of my movements generally.

Among the telegrams to which reference has been made, as calling me back to Washington, were the following:

WASHINGTON, D. C., November 20, 1919.

Hon. ALBERT B. FALL,
United States Senator,
Three Rivers, N. Mex.

We have conferred with Fletcher. In view of new developments we agree that you should return here as soon as possible after the wedding and not proceed with hearing or other committee work at present. Please answer.

FRANK B. BRANDEGEE.
CHARLES S. THOMAS.
MARCUS A. SMITH.

WASHINGTON, D. C., November 24 1919.

Hon. A. B. FALL,
United States Senator,
Paso Del Norte Hotel, El Paso, Tex.

Have conferred with Fletcher. Absolutely necessary you should be here at opening of Congress. Am satisfied nothing can be done until you arrive.

FRANK B. BRANDEGEE.

Prior to the receipt of the telegram of November 24, I wired my secretary, Mr. Safford, to confer directly with Ambassador Fletcher, showing him my telegram. In answer, my secretary telegraphed me, referring to Mr. Fletcher:

* * * Believes there will be day or so delay in reaching decision. Deems it inadvisable issue statement from El Paso. Believes if given out here much more effective and dignified, if not by administration, then by Congress, if thought best. Believes you should be here at opening of session.

Confirming this telegram, my secretary wrote me as follows:

With regard to your return, he thought you should be here when Congress convenes. In this connection he referred to the investigations of the subcommittee and said that he hardly thought it necessary for them to be continued, "as we have sufficient evidence or data on hand."

I hurriedly closed up matters temporarily with our investigators and left El Paso, coming directly to Washington, where I arrived at 4.30 in the afternoon of December 1, 1919. I was met at the Union Station by a messenger from the Secretary of State and also by Mr. Boaz Long, representing the Department of State, and requested to proceed in Mr. Long's motor to the residence of the Secretary of State, Mr. Lansing, without delaying either at my office or my hotel.

I had a very pleasant and interesting consultation with Mr. Lansing, discussing the Jenkins case and discussing in detail the matters hereinafter set out in the memorandum presented to the President of the United States. While no definite, specific conclusion was reached at this conference as to the details of immediate, specific action, the steps thought necessary by both the Secretary and myself to be taken concerning the various very important matters of dispute with Mexico were very thoroughly discussed and, I am happy to say, with no difference of opinion.

It was understood that possibly one or more resolutions concerning Mexico might be introduced in the Senate by Senators other

Nov 2.
1919

than members of your subcommittee, unless the committee itself, or some member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, introduced some resolution with reference to Mexico.

It was decided that the Secretary of State should name a representative from his department to represent him in close and continuous contact with myself, as representing the Senate, through the chairmanship of the Subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations dealing with Mexican affairs.

On the next morning a message by telephone from the Secretary of State, notified my office that Ambassador Fletcher had been designated by the Secretary to represent his department and to consult with, and be in continuous touch with your subcommittee and its chairman. I at once telephoned to Ambassador Fletcher, asking him to come to my office in the Senate Office Building immediately, which he did. Upon his arrival there, I handed him for his consideration draft of two proposed concurrent resolutions to be offered by myself and, after consultation, we agreed upon the resolution to be so offered, which is in words and figures as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the action taken by the Department of State in reference to the pending controversy between this Government and the Government of Mexico should be approved; and, further, that the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, requested to withdraw from Venustiano Carranza the recognition heretofore accorded him by the United States as President of the Republic of Mexico and to sever all diplomatic relations now existing between this Government and the pretended Government of Carranza.

In company with Ambassador Fletcher I proceeded immediately to the Senate Chamber, while the ambassador proceeded to the Diplomatic Gallery thereof. I offered the resolution, and the same was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The committee being called together for the consideration of the resolution, Ambassador Fletcher appeared before it and announced that, at the request of the Secretary of State, he desired to say that the latter would prefer that the resolution be separated and the first portion, endorsing his action in the pending controversy, be adopted immediately, and that action upon the remaining portion be deferred.

The Secretary of State himself came before the Committee on Foreign Relations after the recess and repeated this request and made a somewhat extended statement, during which it developed that the President of the United States had not been informed by the Secretary, directly, at least, concerning Mexican affairs since the return of the President to Washington from his western tour and since his illness.

Thereupon the Committee on Foreign Relations, upon motion, named Senators Hitchcock and Fall to wait upon the President concerning the proposed resolution, and to inform him of the reasons actuating myself in offering the resolution for action by the Congress.

An appointment was made for the following day, when Senators Hitchcock and Fall waited upon the President, and the latter Senator made a verbal statement, referring to various documents and other evidence, and touching upon various phases of Mexican

matters, and of certain disputes between this country and Mexico relating thereto.

The President requested Senator Fall, if possible, to prepare for him at once, a written statement or memorandum, covering the matters reported upon verbally by Senator Fall to him.

Returning to my office I immediately dictated such statement and sent it by special messenger to the White House. This was upon the afternoon of Friday, December 5, 1919. On the following morning Mr. Tumulty, Secretary to the President, over the telephone notified me that he had delivered the memorandum to the President the night before, that is to say, Friday, the 5th.

Shortly after noon on Monday, the 8th of December, I received from the President a communication, which is as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington.

8 December, 1919.

MY DEAR SIR: Thank you very much for your kind promptness in complying with my request that you send me a copy of the memorandum report of the subcommittee on Mexican affairs of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I shall examine it with the greatest interest and care. What you told me of the investigation, on Friday last, prepares me to find in it matter of the greatest importance.

You ask an indication of my desire with regard to the pending resolution to which you and Senator Hitchcock called my attention on Friday, and I am glad to reply with the utmost frankness that I should be gravely concerned to see any such resolution pass the Congress. It would constitute a reversal of our constitutional practice which might lead to very grave confusion in regard to the guidance of our foreign affairs. I am confident that I am supported by every competent constitutional authority in the statement that the initiative in directing the relations of our Government with foreign governments, is assigned by the Constitution to the Executive, and to the Executive, only. Only one of the two Houses of Congress is associated with the President by the Constitution in an advisory capacity, and the advice of the Senate is provided for only when sought by the Executive in regard to explicit agreements with foreign governments and the appointment of the diplomatic representatives who are to speak for this Government at foreign capitals. The only safe course, I am confident, is to adhere to the prescribed method of the Constitution. We might go very far afield if we departed from it.

I am very much obliged to you for having given me this opportunity to express this opinion.

Very truly yours,

WOODROW WILSON.

HON. ALBERT B. FALL,
United States Senate.

Shortly thereafter I gave publicity to a statement concerning this matter, in which statement was included a verbatim copy of the memorandum sent to the President, and to which his foregoing letter refers.

The statement and the memorandum are as follows:

STATEMENT.

The President's letter deals exclusively with the propriety of passing the resolution recommending the withdrawal of the recognition of the Carranza Government, and his comments relate directly and only to that proposition. It is surprising that at this time it should be stated that the suggestion of the Senate that such recognition should be withdrawn should constitute a reversal of our constitutional practice. From the beginning of the Government the Senate has felt free and has exercised its privilege over and over again to make any suggestions in respect to all phases of foreign relations. There is nothing in the Constitution that requires that the initiative with respect to foreign relations

shall be limited to the Executive. Of course, he may, and properly, because of his extraordinary relation to foreign affairs, in ordinary cases be the source of negotiation. The President's general statement that only one branch of the Congress, namely, the Senate, has any relation to foreign affairs, and the Senate only when its advice is sought by the Executive, is contradicted by a hundred precedents. Indeed, the precedents have gone so far that in a number of cases the advice has been the advice of negotiation, and even as solemn engagements as treaties have been made not only upon the suggestion of the Senate but in the exact terms that the Senate has suggested. A discussion by Senator Lodge, published in Scribner's some years ago, and more recently by the late Senator Bacon of Georgia, has been supposed generally to have put at rest the question that the Senate may only advise when its advice is sought.

By this resolution the Senate did not attempt to withdraw recognition or break off relations, but the concurrent resolution contained a suggestion or request to the President that he do so. Such suggestion is entirely in harmony with precedent.

The President states in the first paragraph of his letter that he shall "examine it (my written memorandum furnished him Friday night) with the greatest interest and care. What you told me of the investigation on Friday last prepares me to find in it matter of the greatest importance."

It would appear that the President has not as yet examined this written memorandum, and, of course, under the circumstances, I will again request the committee to postpone action upon the resolution, or upon any phase of the Mexican matter until he has had time to give the subject his consideration.

The resolution was introduced by myself after consultation with numbers of my colleagues and others because of the fact that we considered it of the greatest importance that the matter should immediately be presented to the attention of the President, and because we were reliably informed that the matters referred to in the statement made by myself to the President and to some extent reincorporated in the written memorandum, had not been called to his attention at all, or by any one.

The memorandum presented to the President on Friday evening was as follows:

MEMORANDUM.

In pursuing the investigation concerning appeals to the laboring element in the United States to prevent intervention in Mexico it became evident that many doubtless very sincere persons were entirely ignorant of Mexican matters in general, and particularly of the subjects which they were attempting to discuss.

During such investigation the committee ascertained that the Carranza Government itself was also conducting propaganda of like character, and in many instances the organizations referred to were being used by the Carranza Government for such purposes.

In following up this line the committee at an early date became convinced that the Carranza Government, through its consuls general in this country, was in more or less close contact with the more extreme radical elements in the United States, and was using propaganda with such elements.

The committee had its attention called to a letter from Consul General R. P. de Negri to a member of the Mexican Senate of Mexico City, dated New York, October 23, 1919, and published in Spanish in a Mexico City daily paper of November 6, 1919, in which the consul general calls attention to the fact that he is in touch with radicals and others in the United States favoring the nationalization of all property, and congratulates the Mexican Senator upon the ground that Mexico had set an example in such nationalization, and that he, de Negri, in 1917, had made up his mind to engage in propaganda favorable to us (Mexico) by having our constitution printed in English, etc., etc.

There was obtained from a Mexican consulate in Texas a pamphlet entitled, "The Conspiracy Against Mexico," by one Arthur Thomson. In this pamphlet, among other things, comparison is made between the Mexican constitution and the Soviet Government in Russia, and the charge is made that the American Government has placed every obstacle in the way through protest, etc., of the Mexican Carranza Government carrying out the provisions of the Mexican Constitution, and nationalizing all forms of property. Strong criticism is directed at President Wilson for his actions in this regard, and attention is called to certain speeches made by the President as being naturally contradictory in their terms with reference to Mexico, and the general tenor of the

document is to hold President Wilson responsible for interference with the Carranza Government in Mexican affairs.

Even stronger criticism is directed at Secretary Lane, the charge being that he, while a member of the American-Mexican Joint Commission, was attempting to browbeat the Mexicans into yielding the guarantees demanded by the Rockefellers, the Guggenheims, the Dodges, and the Dohenys." By causing a letter upon private stationery to be written to the Mexican Embassy stating that the writer understood that this pamphlet was being distributed by the embassy and expressing a desire that a copy might be mailed to a private address in the city of Washington, an immediate response was had by the receipt in a plain envelope of a copy of such document.

The committee caused a letter to be written to the author of the pamphlet, directed from a Southwestern town, in which the writer, under a German name, requested copies of the pamphlet and suggested that through certain influences which he might wield the Mexican Government might be persuaded to purchase and circulate the Thomson pamphlet. An immediate reply was received from the author, stating, among other things, that the consul general of Mexico at San Francisco had already purchased for distribution 5,000 copies of such pamphlet, and that they were being distributed in the United States and other countries, and also stating that should the consul general be able to obtain from his Government further funds for such purposes, an increased number of such pamphlets would be so distributed.

The committee obtained possession of a copy in Spanish of what Mr. Carranza calls his "Bluebook," embracing some 400 printed pages, in which at various places attention is called to the oppressive policy of the United States Government toward Mexico, and stress is laid upon the fact that President Carranza has resisted every such encroachment, and in every instance from the first proposed Niagara conference down to and including the American protests as to nationalization of lands and other properties, that Carranza had been successful by refusing absolutely to yield in any respect to the demands of this Government.

Attention of the committee was called to conditions along the border in Arizona and in southern Texas, and in the opinion of the committee such conditions were rapidly taking on the same character which had been assumed in our relations with Mexico prior and subsequent to October, 1915. As will be recalled, early in the year of 1915 there was issued at Monterrey, Mexico, and a little place known as San Diego, Tex., by certain Mexicans, what was known as the "Plan of San Diego." It was declared that on the 20th of February, 1915, there should arise a revolution against the Government and the country of the United States of North America; that the independence and segregation of Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, Colorado, and upper California should be proclaimed, as the Republic of Mexico had been robbed of such States; it was proclaimed that no prisoners should be held, whether civilians or soldiers, and that North Americans over 16 years of age should be put to death; that the Indians of Arizona and other States in the named zone should be invited to join and be given guaranties that the lands which had been taken away from them should be returned, etc.; that the States above, after being declared an independent Republic, should later request annexation to Mexico without reference to what form of government the latter country might have at the time; that independence should be obtained for the negroes, and that they, the negroes, should be aided in obtaining six States of the American Union, which States border upon those mentioned as to be annexed to Mexico, etc.

Of course, this plan soon became known to the authorities of Texas, if not to the authorities of the United States, and was given more or less publicity. It was so fantastic and struck every American as being so childish and ridiculous that no one with ordinary intelligence believed at the time that any responsible Mexican could be cognizant of it, or at least could propose to assist in carrying out the plan.

From the 20th of February, or shortly thereafter, in the year of 1915, up to and following the recognition of Carranza by this Government as de facto president in October, 1915, various attacks were made upon citizens, upon railroads and other property, and upon the Regular United States soldiers stationed along the border and within the State of Texas. Various conflicts occurred, and a large number of Americans were killed, as well as a large number of Mexicans from old Mexico.

It was, of course, well known to the authorities that among the Mexicans who were killed in these attacks there were both soldiers and officers in the Carranza uniform and belonging to the so-called constitutionalist Carranza forces; even yet it was not generally believed that responsible officers in Mexico were aiding or abetting any such movement.

In June, 1916, Secretary of State Lansing, in a message to Mr. Carranza, who had been recognized by this Government prior to that time, called attention to the fact that Carranza soldiers and officers had been engaged in these attacks in Texas, and had even gone to the border upon Carranza trains for the purpose of such attack.

Several indictments were found against various Mexicans in the State and even in the Federal courts of Texas for murder, in what is known as the Arce case, the defendants being convicted of murder in the first degree, and sentenced to death. After an appeal to the highest court of criminal jurisdiction, i. e., the Court of Criminal Appeals of Texas, this case was considered and a comparatively recent decision published in the 202d S. W. Reporter. The court unanimously decided that although the defendant and his companions had killed Oberlies, a corporal in the United States Regular Army, in a night attack upon the soldiers sleeping in their tents at San Ygnacio, that they could not be held for murder because under the evidence in the case they were soldiers in the Carranza Army acting under order of their superior officers, who were commissioned in the Carranza Army; that they were sent from Monterrey and other places in Mexico to carry on war against the United States; that the state of war actually existed; and that these men were doing their duty as soldiers and officers in obedience of orders; that under such circumstances, the state of war existing between Carranza and the United States, these parties, although guilty of killing our soldiers at night, could not be held for murder.

The fact is, as will be shown by evidence in the possession of the committee, that later several Mexicans engaged in carrying out this "Plan of San Diego" were given high commissions by Mr. Carranza, and some of them created, or made, governors of states. Among such men so rewarded were Agustin Garcia, Niceforo Zambrano, and Gen. Nafarrate. Gen. Garcia was afterwards made Attorney General of the Republic of Mexico under the constitutional Government, and is still a high official of that Government.

The trial of the Arce case developed many facts heretofore not understood, but the decision itself has not been given publicity and being of comparatively recent date had not attracted attention which it deserved. Were it not for the fact that conditions similar to those existing in 1915 appeared to be gathering along the border, the committee although after hearing additional evidence, and reading and considering the opinion of the court referred to, were convinced that Carranza had actually carried on a war against the United States while his representatives were seeking recognition at the hands of President Wilson, would have passed the matter by as not bearing directly upon the situation at this crisis. However, at the very moment of closing this investigation of the acts of Carranza in favoring and attempting to carry out the "Plan of San Diego," evidence was brought to the committee not only of the propaganda efforts of the Carranza Government referred to, and of the agitation being carried on by the Carranza consuls and diplomatic agents in this country with the radical revolutionary element in the United States, but further evidence was presented showing that Carranza himself directly was now engaged in assisting in the formulation, or at least with knowledge that plans were being formed similar to those in the "Plan of San Diego" in some respects, and that he was lending Government assistance to the carrying out of such plans, which were again directed to revolutionary effort in the United States, formerly named in the "Plan of San Diego."

The committee has in its possession photostatic copies of two letters sent by V. Carranza, and directed to Aguirre Berlanga, Minister of Gobernacion of Mexico, in one of which he directed pecuniary assistance, etc., to be rendered to two men coming from Texas, who are in Mexico with one Mr. Juan M. Garcia, and in the other letter dated June 14, 1919, Mr. Carranza states to Mr. Berlanga that there are three men—two from Texas. This letter reads as follows:

"V. C.,"

"Senor LIC. MANUEL AGUIRRE BERLANGA,

MEXICO, June 14, 1919.

"ESTEEMED FRIEND: Senor Lino Caballo, bearer of this letter, is the person who, in company with two friends, will bring to you the manifestos and the plan which they desire to put into practice in the State of Texas.

"This plan being very favorable for Mexico, please aid them in every way and give the necessary instructions in the frontier States.

"I remain your affectionate friend,

"V. CARRANZA."

Of course this letter of itself is evidence that Mr. Carranza is ordering the frontier States of Mexico to be prepared to take some action concerning some plan to be carried out in the State of Texas, which plan will be explained and is to be explained by the men introduced by Mr. Carranza to Mr. Berlanga.

Following this or contemporaneous with the receipt by the committee of this photostatic copy, the committee came into possession of the notes of the proceedings of the secret meeting of Lodge 23, an organization of extreme agitators and I. W. W. members in the City of Mexico, held on October 15, 1919.

The notes referred to state that at this meeting on October 15 of Lodge 23 there appeared three delegates, two Americans and one Mexican, who had arrived from the United States, and who claimed that "the society" would be able at the beginning of next November (that is the month of November, 1919 just passed) to call a general strike of all miners and metal workers in the United States; that they have 3,000,000 adherents in that country where they will be able to seize one western and two Atlantic ports; that a large number of American soldiers were preparing to take sides with them, and that they proposed to establish a capital of a reformed Government of the United States in the State of Colorado; that when such revolution was successful, the Mexicans rendering their assistance, the border States which were acquired by the United States under the Treaty of 1848 would be returned to Mexico.

From evidence in its possession the committee is prepared to say that the three men referred to in the minutes of this meeting are the same three men, or at least that the two Texans or Americans were two of the same men referred to by Carranza in his letter of instructions to Berlanga, which is quoted above.

Again this matter would seem preposterous, ridiculous, and so fantastic as of itself to deserve little attention were it not first, for the fact, that it is similar in all essentials to the "Plan of San Diego," which the only judicial tribunal passing upon the question was declared to have been backed or supported by armed forces through a state of war by V. Carranza in 1915; and second, were it not for the fact that the "Plan of San Diego" itself antedating, and this present plan following, were and are in exact line with the note of June 19, 1917, from Zimmerman to Von Eckhart, then ambassador of Germany to Mexico, which among other things, proposed that—

"We (Germany) shall give general financial support (to Mexico) and it is understood that Mexico is to reconquer the lost territory in New Mexico, Texas, and Arizona," and in which Von Eckhart was further instructed to suggest to Mexico that its president, that is V. Carranza, on his own initiative "should communicate with Japan suggesting adherence conditions to this plan and at the same time offer to mediate between Germany and Japan."

In pursuing its line of investigation there came into the hands of the committee a paper which the committee is precluded for very grave reasons from quoting in full, but for the authenticity of which the committee vouches, in which it is stated that a high official of Mexico would communicate to another high official that the "treaty with Japan is coming along," and that the writer is convinced of the great advantage which it would bring Mexico for its national integrity. The committee is also in possession of certain official statements to the effect that great commercial activity might be started in Mexico by reason of the initiative of wealthy Germans, to whom the Mexican Government has the intention of lending its decided support.

The committee may say that these last two matters referred to occurred, or the statements were made as referred to, within the past six months; that they were subsequent to Carranza's introduction of the three men to Berlanga and prior to the meeting of Lodge 23 in Mexico City on October 15.

In its investigation as throwing light upon the attitude and frame of mind of V. Carranza toward the United States and its President, the committee was

interested in obtaining authentic copies of other correspondence of V. Carranza, other than that heretofore referred to, and among other things, of a letter, a photostatic copy of the original in Spanish being obtainable here at any moment, of which the following is a translation:

"[Private correspondence of the President of the United Mexican States.]

"MEXICO, D. F., *June 29, 1919.*

"MISS HERMILA GALINDO,

"*Ignacio Ramirez St., No. 6, City.*

"ESTEEMED YOUNG LADY: It is necessary that your book, 'The Carranza Doctrine,' be finished in a short time, since I desire that you immediately proceed to write a second part of it, for which purpose I shall shortly send you a 'Bluebook,' which we are about to publish and which will serve to justify the attitude of my government in its systematic hostility toward foreign speculators, especially Americans and English.

"Do not forget my injunction to describe in lively colors the tortuosity of the American policy with relation to our country, causing the figure of Wilson to stand well out as the director of that policy. I also enjoin you to be very careful about the corrections which I have made in the original (manuscript) which you brought me.

"I salute you affectionately.

"V. CARRANZA."

The committee calls attention to the fact that the Bluebook, which can be produced, and which has been heretofore referred to, is mentioned in this letter to Miss Galindo; and also to the statement concerning the attitude of the Government of Mexico, or as Mr. Carranza accurately phrases it, "My government," in its systematic hostility toward foreign speculators, especially Americans and English.

Also the committee calls attention to the direction to Miss Galindo that she describe "in lively colors" the "tortuosity" of the American policy with relation to Mexico, and the direction to cause "the figure of Wilson to stand well out as the director of that policy." It will also be seen that Mr. Carranza is correcting proof as well as directing what shall be said in the book just written and the one to be written by Miss Galindo.

The committee calls attention to the expression with reference to the Wilson policy in Mexico, used by Mr. Carranza, as in direct line with the purposes and statements in the propaganda pamphlet of Arthur Thomson being circulated in this country by Mexico, and to similar statements made in the Carranza Bluebook referred to, and emphasized in Miss Galindo's book, "The Carranza Doctrine," the latter two of which are, as heretofore said, in Spanish, and as declared, for the purposes of impressing upon Latin America the Carranza doctrines and "the tortuosity" of the American policy with relation to Carranza as directed by President Wilson.

The committee has in its possession, and in its files and records, evidences of outrages perpetrated upon Americans for the last few years in Mexico, of the destruction of American property, and of attacks on American life, property, and property rights, convincing it of the determined policy of Mr. Carranza to drive all foreigners, and particularly to drive British and Americans from the Republic of Mexico; in fact, it can be asserted that among many high officials of the Carranza government it is positively stated that the entire policy of the present administration of Mexico is to exclude Americans (although admitting that American investments have built up and civilized the country, and have elevated the Mexican workingman, aiding his condition through the raising of wages and mode of living), for the avowed purposes of retaining for themselves, the governing officials and military clique, at the expense of the working classes, the exploitation and enjoyment of Mexico's resources without reference to the rights of the laboring classes of Mexico.

It is not the purpose of the committee at the present time to attempt further than to report the matters as herein set forth, that same may be considered in connection with the Jenkins case and the other pending serious controversies with Mexico, which Mr. Carranza has declared would mean war if the United States enforced its protest; that the committee may be justified in the eyes of the Senate in recommending, as it has recommended, the breaking off of the relations with Mexico, and the withdrawal of recognition from Carranza.

While it is generally understood that *de jure* as well as *de facto* recognition has been given Carranza by this Government, an examination of the documents communicated to Carranza immediately prior to his supposed *de jure* recognition will disclose that such recognition was made with the statement that Carranza was expected to do certain things, or to cause certain things to be done, which he neither did, nor caused to be done, and which he yet refuses to do, or to cause to be done.

As to a precedent for the withdrawal of recognition of Carranza, it may be said that the United States has been making precedents with relation to Costa Rica, Mexico, Nicaragua, and other Latin-American countries, particularly within the last seven years, and attention may be called to the withdrawal of recognition by President Taft of the Nicaraguan Government a few years since.

The attention of the President was also called specifically to certain acts of the Mexican Government of very recent date in connection with the stoppage of operations by American oil companies in Mexico upon their own lands, and that such action by the Mexican Government was in direct contravention of the distinct warnings of this Government repeatedly that such action should not be taken by Mexico.

It may be well to add to the foregoing the further statement, *viz*: The committee has identified at least two of the men mentioned in the Carranza letters of June 14, and of August 19.

The committee has also identified one of the agents who was to come from New York to Laredo to support revolutionary doctrine, etc. This particular man is in the secret service of Mexico under Aguirre Berlanga.

The committee also has the evidence as to what took place at Bisbee, Ariz., when the Mexican I. W. W., cooperating with other radical I. W. W., threatened the peace of that town and were deported. It was stated in the hearing before W. B. Wilson, and the President's other mediators, that these Mexicans were largely Villa followers, and had arms in the Ajo Mountains which they proposed to use in the revolution at Bisbee. The committee has information leading it to believe that at least one of the men deported was in Mexico City on October 15, and at the secret meeting of Lodge 23 of that date.

The committee knows who Lino Caballo and Juan M. Garcia are, and are fairly familiar with their activities. We desire to say most emphatically that we are not attempting to give publicity to any portion of a great mass of evidence of outrages upon Americans, destruction of American property, incompetence and inability of the so-called Mexican Government, nor touching upon any matters of this character in this merely preliminary report and statement calling attention to matters of particular interest and moment at this immediate time.

The President, having declared his conception of his duty and having stated that he would further familiarize himself with the facts, the responsibility, of course, now rests upon him. Meantime the committee will continue its very interesting, and we hope, profitable investigations.

Respectfully submitted,

ALBERT B. FALL,
Chairman Subcommittee.



LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 015 829 178 2